

## QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

### NUMBERS 84-139

84. Please provide a CD or hardcopies of the "Existing Data Summary" figures not included in the online copy of the Nov 2004 Scoping Document (DOE/OR/07-2178&D1) for BGOU RI/FS. An insert page indicates that these figures are "not available on-line due to size and/or quality. Please contact the Document Mgt Center for hard copies of this information."

Answer: Documents were posted to the Paducah Remediation web site under the Reference Documents link in the Burial Grounds Operable Unit section.

85. In the October 2006 Work Plan for BGOU RI/FS (DOE/OR/07-2179&D2/R1), only Chapter 9 "Field Sampling Plan" is provided. Please make the remainder of the document available.

Answer: The remainder of DOE/OR/07-2179&D2/R1 was posted to the Paducah Remediation web site under the Reference Documents link in the Burial Grounds Operable Unit section.

86. Is any soil contamination under the facilities that has to be removed or treated, going to be done as part of the demolition activities or as part of the Site Wide ROD activities?

Answer: Per the Site Management Plan for FY 2009 (DOE/LX/07-0185&D2), a key DOE planning assumption from the life cycle baseline for the D&D Operable Unit is that soils under facilities will be left and will be addressed as part of the Soils Operable Unit Phase II post gaseous diffusion plant shutdown.

87. What is the current projected date for the Onsite CERCLA Disposal Cell to be available to accept waste? Is it an accurate assumption that the C410/420 Complex will have to be disposed of at another facility, and the C-340 Complex and other Inactive Facilities can go to the Onsite CERCLA Disposal Cell?

Answer: Per Section C.1.6 of the RFP, the Offeror is required to submit a Record of Decision by 1/4/2011. If the decision is to dispose of waste on-site, continual on-site remedial action is required to commence within 15 months and the Offeror will provide its own construction and commencement of operations assumption. C-410/420 material can be disposed at the C-746-U Landfill if it meets the Waste Acceptance Criteria, stored on-site in order to wait for an on-site cell if a Record of Decision supports it, or sent off-site. This is true for all D&D facilities.

88. Will the Onsite CERCLA Disposal Cell be able to accept RCRA and TSCA/LLW?

Answer: The final Waste Acceptance Criteria for a CERCLA Disposal Cell has not been determined nor has an on-site/off-site decision been made. If a ROD supports an on-site cell, the assumption is that it will allow for disposal of RCRA and TSCA/LLW.

89. Will the Onsite CERCLA Disposal Cell be able to accept contaminated material with elevated levels of Tc-99 or are the planned levels accepted for Tc-99 to be comparable to DOE ORO CERCLA Disposal Cell?

Answer: The final Waste Acceptance Criteria for a CERCLA Disposal Cell has not been determined nor has an on-site/off-site decision been made.

90. Will the Onsite CERCLA Disposal Cell be able to accept classified material?

Answer: The final Waste Acceptance Criteria for a CERCLA Disposal Cell has not been determined nor has an on-site/off-site decision been made. If a ROD supports an on-site cell, the assumption is that it will allow for disposal of classified material.

91. What is the basis for Building C-746-Q being a Hazard Category-2 Nuclear Facility, and can it be reduced to a less hazardous facility classification?

Answer: The C-746-Q facility is a Hazard Category 2 nuclear facility based on the fissile material being stored in the facility. The hazard categorization must remain in place as long fissile material is being stored there. Removal of the fissile material (through waste disposition) would permit the facility to be downgraded.

92. How much classified waste is projected for the Onsite CERCLA Disposal Cell?

Answer: There are approximately 190,000 yd<sup>3</sup> of classified waste projected for the On-site CERCLA Disposal Cell over the project lifecycle.

93. Do the PGDP buildings have a Crane Certification Program and is it being applied to the bridge cranes within the facilities? Who will be responsible for this program, the Remediation Contractor or Infrastructure Contractor?

Answer: There is no current Building Crane Certification Program. Cranes are brought as needed onto the site for activities by the infrastructure and remediation contractors. Each contractor includes certification requirements into their procurement documents and then verifies crane inspection requirements as part of the receipt process.

94. DOE has posted fringe rates for exempt and non-exempt staff (55% and 85% respectively) as well as an exempt wage determination schedule. Please identify the non-exempt wage determination schedule to which the 85% rate is applied

Answer: DOE has not posted an exempt wage determination schedule. The RFP includes a reference to Incumbent Employee Average Labor Rates to be used for

proposal preparation purposes in accordance with Section L.5. The non-exempt wage determination rate schedules are the Service Contract Act wage determination and the Davis Bacon wage determination in Section J of the RFP, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement posted in the reference documents at the Paducah Remediation web page.

95. RFP Section L.2(g) requires that each volume contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, including a definition for each. Is this glossary to be by Volume or is it to be a combined glossary for all abbreviations and acronyms used throughout every volume?

Answer: Each Volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used in that Volume, including a definition for each.

96. RFP Section L.2(i) requires that proposal pages shall be single sided. Would it be acceptable to print the financial statements required in Volume III double-sided to reduce the quantity of paper and sheer size of this Volume?

Answer: Yes. Section L.2(i) will be amended to reflect that items required in the Volume III cost and fee proposal such as already existing reports (i.e. financial statements and annual reports) may be double sided pages.

97. Section L.5 Attachment 7 Attached Excel cost spreadsheets requires subcontractor (\$5 million or more) to provide the fringe benefit, direct labor overhead, and G&A rates. Our teaming partners would like to provide their proprietary rate information in a sealed envelope behind each L-7 Excel sheet. Is this acceptable? Also can the electronic versions of these subcontractor L-7 Excel Sheet be provide separately on indexed CDs?

Answer: Offeror's are allowed to have teaming partners provide sealed envelopes of proprietary rate information. Additionally, teaming partners are allowed to submit electronic versions of L-7 Excel Sheets separately, as long as the prime contractor places the total subcontract costs in its spreadsheet.

98. Section L. 4(b) requires the offeror to provide a WBS and WBS description at a minimum of a level 4. Is this level of detail required for non-discriminating activities such as C.1.10.5 Transportation?

Answer: Yes. A WBS and WBS description is required for non-discriminating activities.

99. Does an 11 x 17 page (See L.2(i)) count as 1 or 2 pages?

Answer: An 11 x 17 foldout page will count as one page. Foldouts may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams and other schematics, and not for pages of text.

100. Section L.5 (f)(4)(A) (ii) allows for the use parametric models and estimates. The parametric estimate we intend on using for a specific element does not break out specific labor and non-labor ODCs but only identifies costs associated with activities. Where should these costs be identified in the Attachment L-7 sheets?

Answer: Although parametric estimating is allowed under Section L.5(f)(4)(A)(ii), parametric estimates are only to be used within cost categories. Parametric estimating that cross-cuts cost elements is not acceptable.

101. In the Relevant Experience section you allow a maximum of 10 pages for describing the experience of the team. We are also to include 3 projects for the prime and each major subcontractor. If you have one major subcontractor, just the project descriptions would require 6 pages, if you have 2 major subcontractors, you will need 9 pages only for the project descriptions. Would DOE consider excluding the project descriptions from the page count for this section?

Answer: The page limitations shall remain as written. The references for up to three contracts could be presented in a table on foldout pages. Large sections of text for project descriptions are not required by Section L.4(c). The requirements for the identification for portions of work for each of the referenced contracts and for the work to be performed by each entity should be identified consistent with definitions for size, scope and complexity identified in Section L.4(c).

102. Relevant Experience section L-14 (c) requests only the experience of prime and major subcontractors, may we include other experience of the other teaming partners in this section even if we do not provide project descriptions for them?

Answer: The RFP Section L.4.(c) requirements state that if the Offeror is a newly formed entity, such as a joint venture, LLC, or other teaming arrangement, the Offeror shall provided information for up to three (3) contracts for each of the members of the joint venture, LLC, or other teaming arrangement. If the Offeror is not a newly formed entity, then the experience of any teaming partners would be expected to be an integral part of the relevant experience information provided for the Offeror on its past contracts.

103. L.4(b) requests detailed technical approaches for the Dissolved Phase Plumes and Burial Grounds Operable Unit “as if the baseline assumptions are accurate...” Do we need to assume that the baseline assumptions for all PWS elements are accurate, or only those two?

Answer: Offerors should assume that all baseline assumptions which are contained in the PWS are accurate. In particular for the burial grounds operable unit work, although the final remedy will not be determined until the ROD is finalized, the PWS describes baseline assumptions regarding which SWMUs will be excavated, which will have wastes remain in place, and which will require soil treatment.

104. If in a discriminating PWS element, the FS is to be completed by the previous contractor prior to the start date of this contract, are we to assume that the baseline

remedial option in the FS is the one we must implement? Can we propose our own approach or are we to implement the assumed baseline option?

Answer: For discriminating activities, Offerors have the ability to describe their own approach to meet the PWS requirements, as long as the approach will meet the milestone/schedule requirements in the PWS.

105. Please clarify the description and page count exceptions on page L-7. Section L.2(f) indicates that the Cross Reference Matrix is excluded from the page count. Is the PWS/WBS crosswalk reference on page L-13 Section L.4(a) the same document and therefore excluded from the 75 page limit?

Answer: No. The Cross Reference Matrix which is excluded from the page count is described in Section L.2.(k). See response to question 20 regarding WBS descriptions and crosswalk.

106. In Section L.5 (e) it states "The Offeror shall format and present cost and fee information by completing the required cost templates in Section L, Attachment L-7 and attached Excel cost spreadsheets". In Section L.5 (f) (4) (i) it states "The cost proposal shall include a breakdown of cost correlated with the PWS and consistent with the Offeror's technical proposal (including the proposed integrated critical path method schedule), at a minimum, one level lower than each of the lowest PWS ..."

Does DOE require that each WBS element at one level below the PWS have an L-7 type cost sheet or will the L-7 sheets as provided be sufficient with the supporting resource and ODC information provided at the lower level?

Answer: Offeror's are required to provide Section L, Attachment L-7 worksheets at one level below the PWS.

107. Please clarify what, if any, work the KRCEE group supporting the TCE Fate and Transport Project will perform after completion of the "TCE Aerobic Degradation Fate and Transport Technical Report" (White Paper).

Answer: The KRCEE grant extension includes the following task.  
**TASK 4: FATE & TRANSPORT OF TRICHLOROETHENE (TCE)**

Under this task, KRCEE shall facilitate meetings of the Paducah TCE Fate and Transport Project Team leading to the production of an interim and one final report summarizing the fate and transport of TCE in the vadose zone and aquifer at Paducah, including biological and abiotic degradation mechanisms. The proposal for this task should not include estimates for completion of anticipated field or laboratory work. Any field or laboratory work will be funded separately.

The executed grant extension includes the following objectives for this task:

Specific objectives for this project will be developed by the Project Team and generally include:

- Facilitate meetings and conference calls for the Project Team
- Maintain background documentation and reference material
- Complete geochemical evaluation of RGA
  - Correlate geochemical conditions to NWP and SWP
- Quantify potential for sorption of TCE in the RGA
- Conduct microcosm study
- Evaluate UCRS geochemical and biological degradation
- Coordinate completion of interim and final reports
- Presentations to PGDP CAB, FFA Managers and others as needed

A copy of the “TCE Aerobic Degradation Fate and Transport Technical Report” (White Paper) is posted at the Paducah Remediation web site under the Reference Documents link in the Environmental Monitoring and Reporting section.

108. L.4(2)(j) (Table of Contents) requires the contractor to identify the section, sub-section, **paragraph title**, and page number. Please explain the definition of “paragraph title”. We are interpreting paragraph title as the lowest level of numbered Topic in our outline. Is this the correct interpretation?

Answer: Yes. This interpretation is acceptable.

109. L.4(2)(k) (Cross-Reference Matrix) requires a correlation by page and **paragraph number** to the PWS, Section L. and Section M. Is it intended that the **paragraph title** reference in L.4(2)(j) is the same as the **paragraph number** in L.4(2)(k), or is it your intent that proposers **number** every individual paragraph in its proposal to comply with the Cross Reference Matrix requirements.

Answer: No. Do not number every paragraph. See the response to Question 108.

110. L.4(2)(i) indicates that two columns of text per page and the use of bold-faced type are acceptable. Is the use of italics also acceptable?

Answer: Yes.

111. Section H.1.2 states that baseline efforts after award are expected to be consistent with the Contractor's cost and schedule proposal and that a Risk Management Plan is to be developed utilizing a Monte Carlo analysis to determine cost and schedule contingency at 50% and 80% confidence levels which will be summarized at the PBS and total project levels. Since the L-7 forms do not contain a line item for management reserve, what is DOE's expectation regarding the inclusion of management reserve and its basis in the offeror's proposals?

Answer: Offerors shall not propose Management Reserve Costs, as part of its cost proposal. Offerors are required to propose all costs associated with completing the performance work scope.

112. Please provide copies of the following:

- PRS-RAD-1109 (Rad Control/Monitoring)
- PRS-WSD-0437 (Waste Characterization/Profiling)
- PRS-WSD- 3015 (Waste Packaging)
- PRS-WSD-3025
- PRS-WSD-0661 (Onsite Transportation Safety)
- PRS-CDL-0029 (Waste Management Plan)

Answer: The requested documents are the incumbent contractor's procedures and are not a requirement in this solicitation.

113. Please make available a complete list of all approved procedures in use at Paducah.

Answer: DOE does not approve procedures. A complete list of all approved procedures in use at Paducah is not available.

114. Attachment L-7 Cost Spreadsheets is a Microsoft Excel file which identifies the level at which costs are to be provided for the proposal. It includes a tabs for "Cost by Element WBS 1.5.1" and "Cost by Element WBS 1.5.2". Cost element 1.5 is a non-discriminating activity and the sub-total cost is provided at \$13,000,000. Will DOE remove the tabs for 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 or will they provide the cost that should be included in these sub elements?

Answer: See the response to Question 72.

115. Please make available the RI/FS Work Plan for Waste Disposal Options.

Answer: The RI/FS Work Plan has not been finalized.

116. APPENDIX D: THREE-DIMENSIONAL VISUALIZATION FIGURES is missing from the Remedial Investigation Report for the Burial Grounds Operable Unit. Please make this appendix available.

Answer: Appendix D: Three-Dimensional Visualization Figures is posted on the web site under the Reference Documents link in the Burial Grounds Operable Unit section.

117. The lifecycle baseline documents posted on the EMCBC web site have a data date of April 2006. Please provide more current documents that impart a clear picture of the status of work to date so that we can make reasonable assumptions regarding the status of work activities on day one of the contract.

Answer: The reference documents posted are from the currently approved Critical Decision-2 and 3 Paducah Remediation Lifecycle Baseline. See response to question 42.

118. Paragraph H.1.1(c) requires the contractor “to successfully gain Earned Value Management System certification six months after contract award.” This milestone appears to be out of alignment with the guidance provided in DOE G 413.3-10 Earned Value Management System and optimistic based on recent OECM EVMS certification timelines, which closely followed the process outlined in DOE G 413.3-10. Six months after assumption of operational responsibility (i.e., after contract transition) seems more aligned with the intent of DOE O 413.3A Chg 1 and DOE G 413.3-10 guidance that requires three months of CPR submittals to OECM after the new contract baseline is established.

Would DOE consider revising Paragraph H.1.1(c) to allow six months after assumption of operational responsibility (i.e., end of transition) to successfully gain OECM certification of the contractor EVMS in accordance with DOE G 413.3-10 Earned Value Management System? It should be recognized that the Near-Term Remediation Baseline deliverable (RFP J-4 Item 1) is to be submitted for approval 30 days after the end of contract transition.

Answer: The RFP will remain as written. The contract requirements in Section H.1 are established consistent with OECM timelines and state that “The Contractor shall be prepared to ... successfully gain Earned Value Management System certification six months after contract award” which recognizes the situation that it may take a longer timeline to complete the entire OECM external independent review and certification process.

119. RFP Section K.2 FAR 52.234-3 Notice of Earned Value Management System – Post Award IBR (July 2006). Paragraph K.2(b) requires the offeror to submit a comprehensive plan for compliance with the EVMS guidelines if the offeror is proposing to use a system that has not been determined to be in compliance with ANSI/EIA Standard 748. Paragraph K.2(b)(3) states that this plan will be reviewed and approved by the government before contract award. Is it DOE’s intent to have offeror’s provide this plan with the proposal or can this plan be submitted separately upon notice of an apparent award?

Answer: If the Offeror cannot provide the documentation required in Section K.2.(a) of the RFP, then the plan required in Section K.2.(b) of the RFP must be submitted with the Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors in Volume I of the proposal.

120. Under a contractor teaming arrangement, the responsibilities of the subcontractor flow to the prime contractor. The subcontractor would not have any direct contractual responsibility to DOE. Under this circumstance, should the performance guarantee



required by **L.3(a)(5)** be executed by the subcontractor guaranteeing to the prime contractor full performance of the subcontractor's obligations?

Answer: No, a Performance Guarantee from subcontractors is not required by the Government.

121. The EMCBC Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Environmental Remediation Website presents reference drawings for the C410/420 and C340 Complexes. However, as of 2/10/2009, no characterization data or radiological survey data are available for these facilities. In addition, no general arrangement drawings of process or balance of plant equipment is included with the C410/420 drawings, Please advise if these drawings and data will be made available through the website.

Answer: Additional drawings and radiological survey data by sector have been posted on the Paducah Remediation web page under the reference documents link in the Facilities Disposition section.

122. L.2(i) states that graphs, tables and spreadsheets must be 10 point or larger font. Using 10 pt font in flow charts and diagrams may not be feasible. It will make relatively simply flow diagrams quite large and cumbersome. May offerors utilize any font in flow diagrams and similar graphics so long as they ensure the text is clearly legible? This will make flow diagrams much more useful for DOE in evaluating.

Answer: No. As stated in Section L.2 of the RFP, graphs, tables and spreadsheets where necessary must be 10 point or larger Arial or Times New Roman font type.

123. L.4(a) requires offerors to discuss "crew shifts". What is DOE looking for in the discussion of crew shifts?

Answer: The description of crew shifts should include how the Offeror plans on scheduling work crews (number of shifts per day, shift length, number of work days per week) to accomplish the requirements of the PWS using their proposed approach.

124. L.4(b) states "The Offeror shall describe its approach by Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)..." It further states "The Offeror shall provide a WBS and WBS description, at a minimum, to Level 4." Is DOE asking that the technical approach follow exactly the WBS, down to level 4? Or can Offerors organize their approach at the same level as the PWS (i.e. Level 2 or 3)?

Answer: The description of the technical approach is to be organized such that it follows the WBS outline sequence which can be aligned with the same level as the PWS (i.e., Level 2 or 3 as appropriate).

125. Reference: Page K-3, Section ,K.3 DEAR 952.204-73 FACILITY CLEARANCE, *"Offerors who have either a Department of Defense or a Department of Energy Facility Clearance generally need not resubmit the following foreign ownership information*

*unless specifically requested to do so. Instead, provide your DOE Facility Clearance code or your DOD assigned commercial and government entity (CAGE) code. If uncertain, consult the office which issued this solicitation."*

Question: If an Offeror is a JV, LLC or Teaming Arrangement per the Definition in Section L.2, we understand that the Offeror must submit an SF328 or in the alternative the DOE Security Facility Code or the DoD CAGE Code if the Offeror has either. We presume that all business entities that comprise the Offeror (JV, LLC, or Teaming Arrangement) must also submit Representations and Certifications. Further that these Reps and Certs must include the DOE Facility Clearance Code or DoD CAGE Code or the completed SF 328. Are both of these assumptions correct?

Answer: Yes. These assumptions are correct.

126. It's our understanding that as part of Shaw Environmental's contract with PRS, they currently lease equipment to PRS that is used to provide treatment of extracted water/TCE vapor from the C-400 extraction system. The equipment leases go into the next contract's period of performance. Is this a contract that DOE should post – at least the leased equipment portion?

Answer: No. This contract is not planned to go beyond the end of September 2009.

127. Reference page L-13, Section L.4(b) *"The Offeror shall describe its approach by Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) to the management and execution of project work. The Offeror shall describe how it is going to execute each of the requirements of the PWS. Sufficient detail shall be provided to communicate the Offeror's understanding of the requirements of the PWS. In more detail, the Offeror shall describe how it will execute the work for the burial grounds operable unit project and for the dissolved phase plumes remediation as if the baseline assumptions are accurate and the described work in Section C will be performed."*

Question: Please provide the complete set of baselines and baseline assumptions that we are to use in developing our description of how we will execute the work.

Answer: See response to questions 42, 103, and 117.

128. Reference: Page H-49-50 Section H. 33 Legal Management Plan. Question: Could DOE provide any additional guidance on this plan requirement? Could DOE provide an example plan or an approved plan from any other site that would assist the offeror to understand what is an acceptable deliverable? Has this requirement been imposed before at any other DOE sites or projects?

Answer: The requirement for a legal management plan is required in most major DOE Contracts. It is required as set forth in 10 CFR 719 to be submitted to the Contracting Officer for approval within sixty (60) days of contract award. It is suggested that each offeror familiarize themselves with all sections of 10 CFR 719. In respect to guidance on as to what is required to be in the plan, 10 CFR §719.10 contains the requirements.

129. Reference: Page L-19, L.5 (f)(4) (A) Discriminating Activities(ii) Basis of Estimate, *(ii) Basis of Estimate. Provide a Basis of Estimate that thoroughly documents all estimates. A Basis of Estimate description shall be provided for each activity at the lowest level in the estimate.*

Question: We presume it is not necessary to provide Basis of Estimates for those activities listed in (B) Non-discriminating Activities (DOE Provided Costs). Is this correct?

Answer: This is correct. Offerors are not required to provide a basis of estimate for the non-discriminating activities.

130. Reference: Page L-25 Section L. (k) Escalation. *"The Offeror has the ability to propose its own escalation factors (including supporting documentation) for both direct labor and other than direct labor costs; however, the Offeror's proposed escalation factors shall be at least the escalation rates for direct labor costs and all other than direct labor costs of 3.0 percent and 2.0 percent, respectively, for all fiscal years."*

Question: If the offeror elects to use the minimum escalation levels of 3.0 percent and 2.0 percent, we presume we do not need to provide any supporting documentation. Is this correct?

Answer: This is correct. Offerors using the stated minimum escalation rates are not required to provide supporting documentation.

131. Section L.4.d.(4) requires the Past Performance Questionnaires no later than 5 weeks after issuance of the solicitation. In light of the delay in the due date for proposal, will DOE consider extending the due date for the Past Performance Questionnaires?

Answer: See response to Question 83.

132. During Reinhard's presentation, he indicated that the ER contractor was to provide its dosimetry program. PWS Section C.1.10.3.h) indicates that the Infrastructure Contractor shall provide radiation dosimetry (TLDs/PNADs) and bioassays. Please clarify whether or not dosimetry is GFSI.

Answer: Amendment 001 to the RFP changed Section C.1.10.3.h) of the RFP to read "The Contractor shall provide radiation dosimetry (TLDs/Personal Nuclear Accident Dosimeters (PNADs)) and bioassays as required by 10 CFR 835 for the Contractor."

133. Section L.4.b states that we must provide an Integrated Critical Path Method Schedule. Is this a resource-loaded schedule? What level does this schedule need to show (Level IV, level III)?

Answer: Amendment 001 to the RFP changed Section L.4.b of the RFP to require a critical path method schedule for the discriminating activities defined in Section L.5.(f).(A).(i). The critical path method schedule provided in the technical approach section of the Volume II Technical Proposal should not show resources as the RFP requires that no cost information shall be included in the Technical Proposal, but the schedule shall be consistent with and traceable to the more detailed resource loaded schedule required by Section L.5.(f).(3) of the RFP. The critical path method schedule provided in the technical approach section can be rolled up or summarized at a higher level of detail than the corresponding resource loaded schedule required in the Volume III Cost and Fee Proposal.

134. Will DOE be posting a list of those who attended the pre-bid conference?

Answer: A list of attendees was posted to the Paducah Remediation web site under the Reference Documents link in the Site Visit and Pre-Proposal Conference section.

135. Where do we find information on current staffing levels/project by project?

Answer: Current staffing levels are not available.

136. Under the Bid Document are you required to put in place a Collective Bargaining Agreement?

Answer: Pursuant to Clause H.24 Labor Relations, paragraph (c), the Contractor is required to recognize the USW (United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers Union) for work that has historically and traditionally been performed by USW members and bargain in good faith to a collective bargaining agreement. Offerors are strongly encouraged to review Clause H.24 Labor Relations as well as the Contractor's duties and obligations under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and all applicable labor law and regulations.

137. Under the Bid Document are you mandated to sign a Collective Bargaining Agreement with a particular Union?

Answer: See answer to question 136 above and Clause H.24(c). The Contractor is required to recognize the USW (United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers Union) and bargain in good faith to a collective bargaining agreement with the USW for work that has historically and traditionally been performed by USW members. The USW is the current bargaining agent for the employees.

138. Please provide the authorization basis documents for the Cat 2 facilities which the Contractor will be responsible for under this PWS.

Answer: Documents for the C-340, C-410 and C-746-Q have been posted to the FebBizOpps web site because they are Official Use Only (OUO) documents.

Information on obtaining access to OUO documents is available at the Paducah Remediation web site under the Reference Documents link.

139. The PWS for D&D of inactive facilities provides bidders waste volumes to be used in our proposals. Based on the square footage of the facilities and the available characterization data of those facilities it would appear that the stated volumes are extremely high. Could you provide an updated volume for us to bid or an explanation of where those volumes came from?

Answer: Section C.1.3.2, Table C.1.3.2(b) of the RFP will be amended to reflect the revised waste volumes as follows:

Table C.1.3.2(b) Inactive Facilities Waste Estimates

Waste Type	TSCA	Sanitary	MLLW	LLW
Quantity	Included in MLLW	35,000 ft3	7,000 ft3	451,000 ft3

NOTE: The quantities identified in this PWS are based upon current approximations; actual quantities may vary.